22 Limited Liability Company, MAGIC CARPET PRODUCTIONS, LLC, a New York Limited Liability Company, MAROON 23 ENTERTAINMENT, INC., a New York 24 Corporation, MAROON FILMS, INC., a New York Corporation, PAGE TURNER PRODUCTIONS, INC., a New York 25 Corporation, VISION OF LOVE SONGS, 26 INC., a New York Corporation, AUTOMATIC PRINCESS HOLDINGS, LLC, a Delaware 27 Limited Liability Company, LOTION, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company,

28

- 11. Violation of the Bane Act [Cal Civil Code 52.1]
- 12. Violation on the Unruh Civil Rights Act [Cal. Civil Code 51.9]
- 13. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress
- 14. Battery

- 1 -Complaint for Damages

26

27

28

MIRAGE AIR 12, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, PANIC D BEACH, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, PIPITYPOW PROPERTIES, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, STONEGROOVE, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, STONEWINNER, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, ULIKETHIS, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive

Defendants.

COMES NOW, the plaintiff, LIANNA SHAKHNAZARYAN, for causes of action against the defendants, MIRAGE ENTERTAINMENT, INC., a California Corporation, NEW PAYROLL ASSOCIATES, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, NEW C.A.P.S, LLC., a Delaware Limited Liability Company, WIKKED ENTERTAINMENT, INC., a California Corporation, STELLA BULOCHNIKOV, an individual, MARIAH CAREY, an individual, N.Y. ENTERTAINMENT. INC., a California Corporation, ANTELO ROAD, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company, FRANKLIN VIEWS, LLC, a New York Limited Liability Company, MAGIC CARPET PRODUCTIONS, LLC, a New York Limited Liability Company, MAROON ENTERTAINMENT, INC., a New York Corporation, MAROON FILMS, INC., a New York Corporation, PAGE TURNER PRODUCTIONS, INC., a New York Corporation, VISION OF LOVE SONGS, INC., a New York Corporation, AUTOMATIC PRINCESS HOLDINGS, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, LOTION, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, MIRAGE AIR 12, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, PANIC D BEACH, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, PIPITYPOW PROPERTIES, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, STONEGROOVE, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, STONEWINNER, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company, ULIKETHIS, LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, who complains and alleges as follows:

### **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 1. Plaintiff LIANNA SHAKHNAZARYAN (hereinafter, "SHAKHNAZARYAN" or "Plaintiff") was a resident of Valley Glen, California in the County of Los Angeles at all times material to this complaint.
- 2. Defendant MIRAGE ENTERTAINMENT, INC. (hereafter "MIRAGE") was and is a California Corporation authorized to do business in the state of California with its principal place of business located at 2171 Ventura Blvd. #300, Woodland Hills, CA 91346.
- 3. Defendant NEW PAYROLL ASSOCIATES, LLC (hereinafter "NEW PAYROLL") was and now is a Delaware Limited Liability Company authorized to do business in the state of California and which regularly conducts business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, with a Los Angeles County business address at 2300 Empire Avenue, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Burbank, California, 91504.
- 4. Defendant NEW C.A.P.S, LLC (hereinafter "NEW CAPS") was and now is a Delaware Limited Liability Company authorized to do business in the state of California and which regularly conducts business in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, with a Los Angeles County business address at 10600 Virginia Avenue, Culver City, California, 90232.
- 5. Defendant WIKKED ENTERTAINMENT, INC (hereinafter "WIKKED") was and is a California Corporation authorized to do business in the state of California with its principal place of business located at 2171 Ventura Blvd. #300, Woodland Hills, CA 91346.
- 6. Defendant N.Y. MIRAGE ENTERTAINMENT, INC., was a now is a California Corporation authorized to do business in the state of California with its principal place of business located at 2171 Ventura Blvd. #300, Woodland Hills, CA 913466.
- 7. Defendant ANTELO ROAD, LLC, was a now is a California Limited Liability Company authorized to do business in the state of California with its principal place of business located at 2171 Ventura Blvd. #300, Woodland Hills, CA 913466.
- 8. Defendant FRANKLIN VIEWS, LLC is a New York Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business located at 99 Washington Avenue, Suite 805a, Albany New York, 12210.

- 9. Defendant MAGIC CARPET PRODUCTIONS, LLC is a California Limited Liability Company authorized to do business in the state of California with its principal place of business located at 4123 Lankershim Boulevard, North Hollywood, CA 91602.
- 10. Defendant MAROON ENTERTAINMENT, INC., is a New York Corporation with its principal place of business located at 99 Washington Avenue, Suite 805a, Albany New York, 12210.
- 11. Defendant PAGE TURNER PRODUCTIONS, INC., is a New York Corporation with its principal place of business located at 99 Washington Avenue, Suite 805a, Albany New York, 12210.
- 12. Defendant VISION OF LOVE SONGS, INC., was and is a California Corporation authorized to do business in the state of California with its principal place of business located at 2171 Ventura Blvd. #300, Woodland Hills, CA 91346.
- 13. Defendant AUTOMATIC PRINCESS HOLDINGS, LLC, is a Delaware Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business located at 1013 Centre Road, Suite 403S, Wilmington, Delaware, 19805.
- 14. Defendant LOTION, LLC, is a Delaware Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business located at 1013 Centre Road, Suite 403S, Wilmington, Delaware, 19805.
- 15. Defendant MIRAGE AIR 12, LLC, is a Delaware Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business located at 1013 Centre Road, Suite 403S, Wilmington, Delaware, 19805.
- 16. Defendant PANIC D BEACH, LLC, is a Delaware Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business located at 1013 Centre Road, Suite 403S, Wilmington, Delaware, 19805.
- 17. Defendant PIPITYPOW PROPERTIES, LLC, is a Delaware Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business located at 1013 Centre Road, Suite 403S, Wilmington, Delaware, 19805.

- 18. Defendant STONEGROOVE, LLC, is a Delaware Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business located at 1013 Centre Road, Suite 403S, Wilmington, Delaware, 19805.
- 19. Defendant STONEWINNER, LLC, is a Delaware Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business located at 1013 Centre Road, Suite 403S, Wilmington, Delaware, 19805.
- 20. Defendant ULIKETHIS, LLC is a Delaware Limited Liability Company with its principal place of business located at 1013 Centre Road, Suite 403S, Wilmington, Delaware, 19805.
- 21. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant STELLA BULOCHNIKOV (hereinafter "BULOCHNIKOV") was and is an individual and a resident of Calabasas, California, in the County of Los Angeles.
- 22. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant MARIAH CAREY (hereinafter "CAREY") was and is an individual residing in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, City of Beverly Hills.
- 23. For purposes of this Complaint, all of the above identified Defendants will be collectively referred to herein as "DEFENDANTS."
- 24. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, of Defendants DOES 1 through 50, are unknown to Plaintiff, who therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint by inserting the true names and capacities of each such Defendant, with appropriate charging allegations, when they are ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the Defendants designated herein as a "DOE" is responsible in some manner for the injuries suffered by Plaintiff and for damages proximately caused by the conduct of each such Defendant as herein alleged.
- 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times material to this Complaint, Defendants, and each of them, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, in addition to acting for himself, herself or itself, and on his, her or its own behalf individually, is and was acting as the agent, servant, employee and representative of, and with the knowledge, consent

and permission of, and in conspiracy with each and all of the named defendants and within the course, scope and authority of such agency, service, employment, representation and conspiracy. Plaintiff further alleges on information and belief that the acts of each of the defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, were fully ratified by each and all of the defendants. Specifically, and without limitation, Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the actions, failures to act, breaches, conspiracy and misrepresentations alleged herein and attributed to one or more of the specific defendants were approved, ratified and done with the cooperation and knowledge of each and all of the defendants, including DOES 1 through 50, and each of them.

- 26. On or about September 21, 2015, Plaintiff was hired by DEFENDANTS to act as CAREY'S personal assistant, in which Plaintiff's job duties consisted of coordinating Ms. Carey's daily activities both at home and while travelling. Because CAREY was, at all times relevant herein, a very well-known celebrity song writer and performer, Plaintiff was required to meet constant demands of great magnitude and often on incredibly short time demands/deadlines.
- 27. Plaintiff's job duties also included acting as the personal assistant to CAREY'S then manager, defendant BULOCHNIKOV. In her capacity as BULOCHNIKOV'S assistant, Plaintiff was responsible for coordinating with Ms. Bulochnikov to ensure that Ms. Carey's personal and professional needs were met, as well as assisting with any daily tasks and/or issues involving CAREY and/or DEFENDANTS which required immediate attention.
- 28. Plaintiff's job duties were demanding and rigorous and required her to be on call twenty-four (24) hours per day, seven (7) days per week.
- 29. At all times mentioned herein, DEFENDANTS controlled the means and manner of Plaintiff's employment.
- 30. Additionally, DEFENDANTS had the power to hire, promote and discharge Plaintiff. Further, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that DEFENDANTS co-mingled resources and assets, and although Plaintiff's paychecks identified MIRAGE ENTERTAINMENT, INC. as the "Controlling Employer" on them, Plaintiff was paid by all DEFENDANTS.
- 31. DEFENDANTS were all owned and controlled by Defendants CAREY and BULOCHNIKOV.

26

27

- 32. Plaintiff's employment was governed by an oral employment agreement, under which Plaintiff would receive an annual salary of approximately \$328,500.
- 33. Plaintiff's employment was governed by other various written and oral promises, policies and procedures promulgated by DEFENDANTS, and DOES 1 through 50, and each of them. By said promises and policies, DEFENDANTS, and DOES 1 through 50, and each of them promised that decisions affecting Plaintiff's employment, including promotion, salary increases, transfers, demotions, and disciplinary action, up to and including discharge, would be made on the basis of merit, just cause and good cause and according to the procedures outlined by DEFENDANTS, and DOES 1 through 50, and each of them. Plaintiff's employment was further governed by an open door policy free of harassment with the insistence that all employees be treated with dignity, respect and courtesy and that all employees be encouraged to approach any employer, supervisor and/or administration with any kind of work-related problems without fear of retaliation of any kind.
- 34. Based upon the above factors, including her oral employment agreement, and her day to day work for the various defendant entities and persons, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that Plaintiff was jointly employed by all DEFENDANTS at all times material herein.
- 35. Throughout her employment with DEFENDANTS, Plaintiff was subjected to severe, pervasive, sexual, derogatory, offensive, physically abusive and outrageous conduct by defendant BULOCHNIKOV, including, but not limited to, the following acts:
- Repeatedly referring to Plaintiff as an "Armenian whore" a "fucking Armenian (a) whore," a "fucking nigger" and an "Armenian princess" in the presence of CAREY, Plaintiff and others.
- (b) Constantly committing acts of physical abuse and battery against Plaintiff, including slapping Plaintiff's buttocks and breasts, as well as pushing Plaintiff and tackling her to the ground and sitting on her.
- Holding Plaintiff down on the ground and urinating on Plaintiff and/or allowing (c) Plaintiff to be urinated upon in the presence of others on multiple occasions.
  - (d) Repeatedly instructing persons to attack Plaintiff, yelling: "Get that bitch! Get that

Armenian bitch!"

- (e) Making repeated offensive, sexual and derogatory comments regarding Plaintiff's Armenian heritage in the presence of Plaintiff, including "Look at that fat Armenian ass!" ... "move your fat Armenian ass!" and also telling Plaintiff that she was a thief and that Plaintiff "probably stole that. You know those fucking Armenians."
- (f) Repeatedly ridiculing Plaintiff about her breasts, including placing objects under Plaintiff's breasts, such as iphones, television remote controls and utensils.
- 36. Defendant CAREY had knowledge of the identified above conduct, as much of such improper conduct was carried out against Plaintiff with CAREY'S knowledge, permission and/or in CAREY'S presence.
- 37. Defendant CAREY also committed acts of physical and emotional/psychological abuse against Plaintiff.
- 38. The above conduct was severe, pervasive and performed by BULOCHNIKOV in her position as Plaintiff's supervisor on a consistent and repeated basis throughout Plaintiff's employment with DEFENDANTS, which fostered and created a hostile work environment.
- 39. DEFENDANTS, by and through their officers, directors, managing agents and/or supervisors, including but not limited to CAREY, were aware of the above abusive and harassing conduct of BULOCHNIKOV, yet took no steps to prevent and/or stop such conduct. Rather, DEFENDANTS, by and through their officers, directors, managing agents and/or supervisors, including but not limited to CAREY, ratified the outrageous conduct by BULOCHNIKOV by continuing to employ BULOCHNIKOV and permitting her to carry out her outrageous and offensive conduct against Plaintiff.
- 40. The severe and pervasive nature of BULOCHNIKOV'S sexual, abusive, offensive and harassing conduct against Plaintiff, as well as the abusive conduct by CAREY against Plaintiff, altered the conditions of Plaintiff's employment so as to create a hostile work environment which was damaging to Plaintiff on the basis of her national origin.
- 41. On or about October 14, 2017, Plaintiff reported BULOCHNIKOV'S harassing and discriminatory and abusive conduct to CAREY while at a resort in Connecticut.

- 42. In direct response to Plaintiff's complaint as set forth above, DEFENDANTS, in furtherance of their campaign of harassment and retaliation, terminated Plaintiff on November 21, 2017. Said discharge is contrary to California *Labor Code* §§6300, 6306, 6405 and 6406(b), which are designed to ensure that employees work in environments free from danger to their safety and/or health and shall not be retaliated against for making complaints when they reasonably believe that laws are being violated. Said discharge is also contrary to Government Code § 12940(a), which states that it is the public policy of the state of California that all employees have to right to employment without being discriminated against because of their national origin.
- 43. Before filing the instant action, Plaintiff exhausted her administrative remedies. On or about August 23, 2018, plaintiff filed a charge of discrimination, retaliation and harassment with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing ("DFEH"). On or about August 23, 2018, and October 9, 2018, plaintiff received Notices of Case Closure, together with Right-To-Sue Notices, copies of which are attached hereto as Exhibit "A."

#### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

### Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy

(As Against All DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive)

- 44. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference, as if set forth in full, each and every allegation contained in the General Allegations above.
- 45. It is the public policy of the State of California as set forth in Labor Code § 98.6 that an employee should not be discharged in retaliation for complaining about and/or reporting improper and/or illegal conduct. It is also the public policy of the State of California as set forth under Government Code §12920 and §12940(a) to protect all persons by allowing them to obtain and hold employment without being discriminated against on account of their gender and/or national origin. In addition, DEFENDANTS' and DOES 1 through 50, conduct violates additional

statutes and policies including, but not limited to, California *Labor Code* §§ 6300, 6306, 6405 and 6406(b), and Government Code § 12940, et. seq., and 42 U.S.C. §2000e-2(a)(1). The conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, as set forth in Plaintiff's General Allegations, above, constitutes a violation of these public policies and constitutes wrongful discharge in violation of the public policy of the State of California.

- 46. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the DEFENDANTS, and each of them, plaintiff has sustained a loss of earnings and benefits, past and future, and a loss of earning capacity, the exact amount of such losses will be stated according to proof, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 425.10.
- 47. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress including, but not limited to, humiliation, embarrassment, mental anguish, and profound shock to the nervous system, all to her general damage, according to proof.
- 48. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the DEFENDANTS, and each of them, plaintiff has suffered severe physical, mental and psychological pain and anguish. As a further result thereof, plaintiff was compelled to and did employ the services of physicians, nurses and the like, the care for her and treat her, and did incur hospital, medical, professional and incidental expenses, and plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that by reason of her injuries, she will necessarily incur additional like expenses for an indefinite period of time in the future, and the exact amount of such expenses will be stated according to proof, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 425.10.
- 49. In terminating plaintiff, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, acted willfully and maliciously and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights, entitling plaintiff to recover punitive damages from defendants, and each of them, in an amount appropriate to punish and set an example of said defendants. The willful, harassing and malicious acts consisted of a known and conscious disregard of plaintiff's employment rights, in violation of Labor Code § 6400 et seq., and Government Code §§12920 and 12940, et. seq.

### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

# Retaliation in Violation of California Labor Code §§ 98.6, 6310 and Government Code § 12940)

(As Against All DEFENDANTS, and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive)

- 50. Plaintiff re-alleges as though fully set forth at length and incorporates herein by reference the allegations contained above, including all of the General Allegations.
  - 51. California Labor Code section 98.6 provides that no person shall harass, discriminate, discharge or retaliate against any employee because such employee has complained of or instituted a claim against any person relating to his or her rights.
  - 52. California Labor Code section 6310 provides that no person shall discharge or discriminate against an employee because the employee has made a written or oral complaint to his employer of unsafe working conditions and/or work practices. Additionally, Government Code section 12940 provides that an employer may not retaliate, by way of discrimination, against an employee for opposing discriminatory conduct.
  - 53. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges, that DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and each of them, harassed and retaliated against Plaintiff by undertaking acts, including but not limited to those acts and omissions set forth in paragraph 35(a)-(f) of the General Allegations, above.
  - 54. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1 through 50, and each of them, plaintiff has sustained a loss of earnings and benefits, past and future, and a loss of earning capacity, the exact amount of said losses to be stated according to proof, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 425.10.
  - 55. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the DEFENDANTS, and each of them, plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress including, but not limited to, humiliation, embarrassment, mental anguish and/or profound shock to the nervous system, all to her general damage in an amount to be stated according to proof.

28

- 56. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the DEFENDANTS, and each of them, plaintiff has suffered severe physical, mental and psychological pain and anguish. As a further result thereof, plaintiff was compelled to and did employ the services of physicians, nurses and the like, the care for her and treat her, and did incur hospital, medical, professional and incidental expenses, and plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that by reason of her injuries, she will necessarily incur additional like expenses for an indefinite period of time in the future, and the exact amount of such expenses will be stated according to proof, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 425.10.
- In retaliating against plaintiff, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, acted willfully and maliciously and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights, entitling plaintiff to recover punitive damages from defendants, and each of them, in an amount appropriate to punish and set an example of said defendants. The willful, harassing and malicious acts consisted of a known and conscious disregard of plaintiff's employment rights, in violation of Labor Code section 6400 et. seq.
- 58. Plaintiff, as a result of the retaliatory conduct of DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1-50 and each of them, is also entitled to a recovery of attorney's fees and costs of suit.

### THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Failure to Prevent Discrimination and Harassment in Violation of Government Code § 12940) (As Against All DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive)

- 59. Plaintiff re-alleges as though fully set forth at length and incorporates herein by reference all of the above allegations, including the General Allegations.
- 60. Government Code § 12940(k) sets forth that an employer must take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent discrimination and harassment, and that failing to do so is a violation of § 12940(k).
- 61. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges, that DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and each of them, knew or should have known that throughout her

employment Plaintiff was subjected to severe and pervasive sexual harassment and discrimination by her supervisors, BULOCHNIKOV and CAREY.

- 62. DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1-50, by and through their managing agents, supervisors and/or directors, failed to take all reasonably necessary steps to prevent such discrimination and harassment from occurring.
- 63. DEFENDANTS' failure to take all reasonably necessary steps to prevent BULOCHNIKOV and CAREY'S discriminatory and harassing conduct caused Plaintiff to be subject to a continuing, rampant, repeated and pervasive campaign of discrimination, abuse and harassment.
- 64. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the DEFENDANTS, and DOES 1 through 50, and each of them, plaintiff has sustained a loss of earnings and benefits, past and future, and a loss of earning capacity, the exact amount of said losses to be stated according to proof, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 425.10.
- 65. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the defendants, and each of them, plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress including, but not limited to, humiliation, embarrassment, mental anguish and/or profound shock to the nervous system, all to her general damage in an amount to be stated according to proof.
- 66. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the DEFENDANTS, and each of them, plaintiff has suffered severe physical, mental and psychological pain and anguish. As a further result thereof, plaintiff was compelled to and did employ the services of physicians, nurses and the like, the care for her and treat her, and did incur hospital, medical, professional and incidental expenses, and plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that by reason of her injuries, she will necessarily incur additional like expenses for an indefinite period of time in the future, and the exact amount of such expenses will be stated according to proof, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 425.10.
- 67. Plaintiff, as a result of the above described conduct of DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1-50 and each of them, is also entitled to a recovery of attorney's fees and costs of suit.

68. In failing to take reasonably necessary steps to prevent Plaintiff from being harassed and discriminated against, DEFENDANTS, and each of them, acted willfully and maliciously and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights, entitling plaintiff to recover punitive damages from defendants, and each of them, in an amount appropriate to punish and set an example of said defendants. The willful, harassing and malicious acts consisted of a known and conscious disregard of plaintiff's employment rights, in violation of Government Code section 12940(k).

### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

### (Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing)

(As Against all DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50)

- 69. Plaintiff re-alleges as though fully set forth at length and incorporates herein by reference all of the above allegations, including the general allegations above.
- 70. Plaintiff's employment was governed by various written and oral promises, policies and procedures promulgated by DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50. By said promises, policies and procedures, DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50. promised that decisions affecting plaintiff's employment, including promotion, salary increases, transfers, demotions and disciplinary action, up to and including discharge, would be made on the basis of merit, just cause and good cause and according to the procedures outlined by DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50. Plaintiff's employment was further governed by an open door policy free of harassment with the insistence that all employees be treated with dignity, respect and courtesy and that all employees be encouraged to approach the administration with any kind of work-related problems without fear of retaliation of any kind.
- 71. Into the employment relationship between the plaintiff and DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50, and each of them, as described above, the law of the State of California implied a covenant of good faith and fair dealing. This implied covenant required that each party to the employment contract acts with fairness and good faith toward the other, and that neither party should take any action to prevent the other from reaping the benefits of the relationship. The

covenant further required DEFENDANTS to refrain from needless injury or damage to the plaintiff.

- 72. In or around the Fall of 2015, and continuing through November of 2017, DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50, and each of them, by and through their employees agents or representatives, particularly defendants BULOCHNIKOV and CAREY, whose acts were authorized, ratified or otherwise approved of by officers, directors and/or other managing agents employed by the defendants, engaged in a continuous course of conduct which, among other things, discredited, harassed, abused, and humiliated the Plaintiff, and ultimately resulted in terminating Plaintiff from her employment with DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50, and each of them.
- 73. In or around the Fall of 2015 and continuing through November of 2017, DEFENDANTS, and DOES 1 through 50, by and through their employees, agents and representatives, engaged in various practices and activities which harassed the plaintiff, causing her upset, anxiety, worry, embarrassment and humiliation, and which created undue difficulty for the plaintiff in performing her job duties as described above. Said activities included, but were not limited to, acts causing humiliation, embarrassment, harassment, including sexual harassment, physical abuse, racial insults, and reprisal in the form of job threats, unwarranted criticism, unfair treatment and job restrictions. Said acts, whether negligently or intentionally performed, were a violation of company policies and procedures as well as public policy and a breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing which existed in the employment relationship.
- 74. The above-described acts of the defendants incorporated herein constituted a breach of this implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and were a substantial factor in causing damages and injury to the plaintiff as set forth below.
- 75. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the defendants, plaintiff has sustained a loss of earning capacity, in addition to a loss of earnings and benefits, past, present and future, the exact amount of which losses which will be stated according to proof pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure, Section 425.10.

#### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(RACIAL DISCRIMINATION – As Against All DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1 through 50, inclusive)

- 76. Plaintiff re-alleges as though fully set forth at length and incorporates herein by reference all of the above allegations, including the General Allegations.
- 77. Plaintiff is and was, at all time material herein, of Armenian origin and therefore protected under California's Fair Employment and Housing Act, *California Government Code*, §12940 et seq. Plaintiff exhausted her administrative remedies and obtained Right-To-Sue letters as required by the FEHA.
- 78. DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1-50, at all material times herein, were Plaintiff's employers subject to the requirements of the FEHA, and had a duty under the FEHA not to discriminate against plaintiff based on her racial origin.
- 79. DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1-50, discriminated against plaintiff and harassed her by subjecting her to hostile and offensive comments and conduct, treating her unfavorably and adversely compared to similarly situated male employees, and by denying her pay and benefits as promised.
- 80. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1 through 50, and each of them, plaintiff has sustained a loss of earnings and benefits, past and future, and a loss of earning capacity, the exact amount of said losses to be stated according to proof, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 425.10.
- 81. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the defendants, and each of them, plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress including, but not limited to, humiliation, embarrassment, mental anguish and/or profound shock to the nervous system, all to her general damage in an amount to be stated according to proof.
- 82. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the DEFENDANTS, and each of them, plaintiff has suffered severe physical, mental and psychological pain and anguish. As a further result thereof, plaintiff was compelled to and did employ the services of physicians, nurses and the like, the care for her and treat her, and did incur hospital, medical, professional and incidental expenses, and plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that by reason

of her injuries, she will necessarily incur additional like expenses for an indefinite period of time in the future, and the exact amount of such expenses will be stated according to proof, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 425.10.

- 83. In retaliating against plaintiff, defendants, and each of them, acted willfully and maliciously and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights, entitling plaintiff to recover punitive damages from defendants, and each of them, in an amount appropriate to punish and set an example of said defendants. The willful, harassing and malicious acts consisted of a known and conscious disregard of plaintiff's employment rights, in violation of Labor Code section 6400 et. seq.
- 84. Plaintiff, as a result of the discriminatory conduct of DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1-50 and each of them, is also entitled to a recovery of attorney's fees and costs of suit.

### **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

### (SEXUAL HARASSMENT)

(As Against All DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50)

- 85. Plaintiff re-alleges as though fully set forth at length and incorporates herein by reference all of the above allegations, including the General Allegations.
- 86. Plaintiff is and was, at all times material herein, a woman with a national origin from Armenia and therefore protected under California's Fair Employment and Housing Act, *California Government Code*, §12940 et seq. Plaintiff exhausted her administrative remedies and obtained Right-To-Sue letters as required by the FEHA.
- 87. California Government Code §12940 (j) prohibits an employer or any person from harassing any employee on the basis of, among other categories, national origin.
- 88. DEFENDANTS violated §12940 (j) when they harassed Plaintiff on the basis of her national origin and took other adverse actions against Plaintiff, based on national origin as set forth herein.
- 89. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1 through 50, and each of them, plaintiff has sustained a loss of earnings and

benefits, past and future, and a loss of earning capacity, the exact amount of said losses to be stated according to proof, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 425.10.

- 90. As a further direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the defendants, and each of them, plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress including, but not limited to, humiliation, embarrassment, mental anguish and/or profound shock to the nervous system, all to her general damage in an amount to be stated according to proof.
- 91. As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conduct of the DEFENDANTS, and each of them, plaintiff has suffered severe physical, mental and psychological pain and anguish. As a further result thereof, plaintiff was compelled to and did employ the services of physicians, nurses and the like, the care for her and treat her, and did incur hospital, medical, professional and incidental expenses, and plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereupon alleges, that by reason of her injuries, she will necessarily incur additional like expenses for an indefinite period of time in the future, and the exact amount of such expenses will be stated according to proof, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 425.10.
- 92. In retaliating against plaintiff, defendants, and each of them, acted willfully and maliciously and with conscious disregard of plaintiff's rights, entitling plaintiff to recover punitive damages from defendants, and each of them, in an amount appropriate to punish and set an example of said defendants. The willful, harassing and malicious acts consisted of a known and conscious disregard of plaintiff's employment rights, in violation of Labor Code section 6400 et. seq.
- 93. Plaintiff, as a result of the harassing conduct of DEFENDANTS, including DOES 1-50 and each of them, is also entitled to a recovery of attorney's fees and costs of suit.

### SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(FAILURE TO PAY EARNED WAGES AND OVERTIME UPON TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT [CAL. LABOR CODE §§ 201, 202, 203, 218, 1194] – Against All DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50)

- 94. Plaintiff re-alleges as though fully set forth at length and incorporates herein by reference all of the above allegations, including the General Allegations.
- 95. Cal. Labor Code §§ 201 and 202 required DEFENDANTS to pay all compensation due and owing Plaintiff immediately upon discharge and no later than seventy-two hours after termination of her employment. Labor Code § 203 provides that if an employer willfully fails to pay compensation promptly upon discharge or resignation, as required under Labor Code §§ 201 and 202, then the employer is liable for waiting time penalties in the form of continued compensation for up to thirty (30) work days.
- 96. California Labor Code section 1194 provides that Plaintiff is entitled to recover in a civil action the unpaid balance of all overtime wages she earned while working for DEFENDANTS.
- 97. DEFENDANTS willfully failed to pay Plaintiff compensation, including earned overtime pay, due upon termination of employment as required by law. As a result, DEFENDANTS are liable to Plaintiff for waiting time penalties under Labor Code §203, overtime penalties under Labor Code section 1194 as well as reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit as permitted by law and equity.

### **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

(BREACH OF ORAL CONTRACT FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENDITURES AS AGAINST ALL DEFENDANT, AND DOES 1-50, and each of them).

98. Plaintiff re-alleges as though fully set forth at length and incorporates herein by reference all of the above allegations, including the General Allegations.

In or around September of 2015, Plaintiff and DEFENDANTS entered into an oral 99. agreement that Plaintiff would be responsible for purchasing various items upon demand by DEFENDANTS, and that Plaintiff would be entitled to full reimbursement for any and all purchases/expenditures that Plaintiff made at the request of DEFENDANTS, including but not limited to purchases and expenditures made for and/or on behalf of CAREY and BULOCHNIKOV.

100. The oral agreement for reimbursement of expenditures is further evidenced by reimbursement forms which Plaintiff was responsible for filling out in detail, identifying the amount of the expenditure, and submitting such reimbursement forms to management and/or BULOCHNIKOV.

101. At the request of DEFENDANTS, Plaintiff made many purchases over the course of her employment with DEFENDANTS, and submitted forms for reimbursement in accordance with the agreement between Plaintiff and DEFENDANTS that Plaintiff would be entitled to full reimbursement for such purchases/expenditures.

102. Despite submitting multiple forms requesting reimbursement for purchases Plaintiff had made at the request of DEFENDANTS, DEFENDANTS breached the oral agreement by failing to reimburse Plaintiff for the expenditures Plaintiff had made.

103. As a result of DEFENDANTS' breach of the oral agreement for reimbursement of expenditures, Plaintiff was damaged in excess of \$600,000 for expenditures Plaintiff made at the request of and/or on behalf of DEFENDANTS, and for which she was never reimbursed, and of which Plaintiff is owed.

# NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION / AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

# (RESCISSION OF CONTRACT BASED ON FRAUD IN THE INDUCEMENT, UNDUE INFLUENCE, UNILATERAL MISTAKE, AS AGAINST DEFENDANT MARIAH CAREY, AND DOES 1 through 50, inclusive)

104. Plaintiff realleges as though fully set forth at length, and incorporates herein by reference, all of the above allegations and statements, including the General Allegations.

105. Plaintiff contracted to and retained a law firm Freedman and Taitelman, LLP to represent Plaintiff in certain claims Plaintiff had against individual, "J.P." but not claims she had against CAREY and the other DEFENDANTS. At the same time, Freedman and Taitelman, LLP was also retained by CAREY to represent CAREY in CAREY'S claims against J.P.

106. Plaintiff executed a conflicts waiver to allow Freedman and Taitelman, LLP to engage in dual representation of both Plaintiff and CAREY regarding their respective claims against J.P.

107. On or about January 30, 2017, with the advice and representation of Freedman and Taitelman, LLP, Plaintiff and CAREY and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and each of them, entered into a written Settlement Agreement and General Release ("Release") regarding settlement of claims against J.P.

18

108. However, the Release contained certain terms and conditions which related to claims completely unrelated to Plaintiff's claims against J.P., and instead operated to release claims Plaintiff held against Freedman and Taitelman, LLP's other client, CAREY.

109. The terms releasing claims by Plaintiff against CAREY were not disclosed by Freedman and Taitelman, LLP to Plaintiff, and such non-disclosure was a fraudulent act, which caused Plaintiff to execute the Release without any knowledge of such terms, specifically the term releasing claims against CAREY.

25

26

27

110. Plaintiff relied upon Freedman and Taitelman, LLP and executed the release on the basis of the legal advice that she received from Freedman and Taitelman, LLP.

- 111. Plaintiff asserts that the aforementioned Settlement Agreement and General Release should be rescinded because the contract was entered into as a result of fraud in the inducement by CAREY'S attorneys Freedman and Taitelman, LLP, undue influence by Freedman and Taitelman, LLP, and/or unilateral mistake.
- 112. For the following reasons, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that no contract was created because her consent was obtained by fraud:
- A. Freedman and Taitelman, LLP represented that it would fairly, ethically and professionally represent the interests of both Plaintiff and CAREY regarding their respective claims against J.P.
- B. Freedman and Taitelman, LLP, knew that the aforementioned representations were not true, as they ultimately planned to effectuate a Settlement and General Release which greatly benefitted CAREY and severely prejudiced Plaintiff, and to withhold disclosure of material terms to Plaintiff, such as terms that would constitute a waiver of claims by Plaintiff against CAREY.
- C. Freedman and Taitelman, LLP made such misrepresentations and non-disclosures, in order to persuade and induce Plaintiff to agree to the Settlement Agreement and General Release.
- D. Plaintiff reasonably relied on Freedman and Taitelman, LLP's representations in agreeing to the Settlement Agreement and General Release.
- E. Plaintiff would not have entered into the Settlement Agreement and General Release if she had known that said Freedman and Taitelman, LLP's representations were not true.
- 113. For the following reasons, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that no contract was created due to undue influence because Plaintiff was unfairly pressured by Freedman and Taitelman, LLP into consenting to the contract:
- A. Freedman and Taitelman, LLP used their fiduciary status as a legal professional to induce or pressure her into consenting to the Settlement Agreement and General Release.

- В. Without the aforementioned fiduciary relationship and representations of fair and ethical legal representation, Plaintiff would not have consented to the Settlement Agreement and General Release.
- 114. For the following reasons, Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that no contract was created due to unilateral mistake:
- Plaintiff was mistaken about Freedman and Taitelman, LLP's representations A. to her, as she reasonably believed that Freedman and Taitelman, LLP would provide her all the rights and privileges she was entitled to as a client, including full disclosure of any ongoing, arising and/or new conflicts of interest which may impact Freedman and Taitelman, LLP's representation of Plaintiff, which Freedman and Taitelman, LLP failed to do.
- Freedman and Taitelman, LLP knew that Plaintiff was mistaken, and used В. those mistakes to take advantage of her.
  - C. Plaintiff's mistakes were not caused by her excessive carelessness.
- Plaintiff would not have agreed to enter into the Settlement Agreement and D. General Release if she had known about the aforementioned mistakes, and/or if she knew Freedman and Taitelman, LLP had no intention of performing their obligations provided for in the retainer agreement for legal services, as well as abiding by the ethical obligations pertaining to attorneys under the law.
- 115. As a result of the above conduct, Plaintiff is entitled to and requests a Recission of the Settlement Agreement and General Release as identified herein.

# **TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

### (SEXUAL BATTERY)

(Against BULOCHNIKOV and DOES 1 through 50

- 116. Plaintiff incorporates all foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth, including the General Allegations.
- 117. Defendant BULOCHNIKOV'S conduct described above was intentional and sexually offensive, constituting sexual battery under California Civil Code section 1708.5, as she

acted with the intent to cause a harmful or offensive contact with an intimate part of Plaintiff, and a sexually offensive contact with Plaintiff directly, or indirectly, resulted.

- 118. BULOCHNIKOV was acting within the course and scope of her employment and/or agency with DEFENDANTS, and DOES 1 through 50, when she committed the sexual batteries against Plaintiff.
- 119. DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50 knew or should have known of BULOCHNIKOV's propensity to engage in sexual misconduct, and in conscious disregard for the safety of others, including Plaintiff, failed to adequately warn and protect Plaintiff against BULOCHNIKOV.
- 120. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50 had advance knowledge of BULOCHNIKOV's inappropriate conduct towards others, and yet continued to employ her. DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50, despite their knowledge of BULOCHNIKOV's history of misconduct and propensity to engage in that conduct continued to employ her and/or failed to supervise her.
- 121. As a direct and legal result of the assaults by BULOCHNIKOV, Plaintiff suffered injuries including, but not limited to, physical and mental pain and suffering, severe emotional distress, physical injuries, past and future costs of medical care and treatment, and past and future loss of earnings and earning capacity, and other damages, in an amount not yet ascertained, but which exceed the minimum jurisdictional limits of this Court.
- 122. In committing the acts described herein, BULOCHNIKOV's conduct was despicable and done with malice and oppression, justifying an award of punitive damages against her.
- 123. DEFENDANTS and DOES 1-50 are also liable for punitive damages because said DEFENDANTS had advance knowledge of the unfitness of their employee, BULOCHNIKOV, and continued to employ her with a conscious disregard of the rights and safety of others, including Plaintiff, and said Defendants were otherwise personally guilty of oppression, fraud, or malice, and otherwise ratified BULOCHNIKOV's acts.

124. Employees, supervisors, directors, and/or officers of DEFENDANTS and DOES 1 through 50 knew of the sexual assaults by BULOCHNIKOV and refused to take any corrective action and BULOCHNIKOV remained employed by DEFENDANTS.

# **ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

### (VIOLATION OF THE BANE ACT (Cal. Civil Code §§52.1, 52)

### (Against All Defendants and Does 1 through 50, inclusive)

- 125. Plaintiff incorporates all foregoing paragraphs, including the General Allegations, of this Complaint as though fully set forth.
- 126. Plaintiff is informed and believes that BULOCHNIKOV intentionally interfered with or attempted to interfere, by threats, intimidation and coercion, with Plaintiff's rights secured by the Constitution as well as the laws of this state, including the right to be free from sexual harassment and assault.
- 127. California Civil Code section 52.1 provides that it is unlawful to interfere with an individual's exercise or enjoyment of any rights under the Constitution of the United States and California by use or attempted use of threats, intimidation or coercion.
- 128. In addition, DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50, acted with reckless disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff and others, and with knowledge of BULOCHNIKOV's propensity and pattern of engaging in inappropriate conduct. DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50 aided, allowed, incited and/or conspired with the denial or attempted denial of Plaintiff's rights as secured by the Constitution and the laws of this state.
- 129. By virtue of their relationship, BULOCHNIKOV held a position of authority, trust and control of Plaintiff and used the context of the relationship to threaten, intimidate or coerce Plaintiff in order to interfere with, or attempt to interfere with, Plaintiff's right to be free from sexual harassment, sexual assault, and sexual battery. Her conduct and actions were unwelcome, pervasive, severe, and offensive.

25

26

27

28

130. BULOCHNIKOV intended to cause a harmful and offensive contact with Plaintiff, and did in fact cause a harmful and offensive contact with an intimate part of Plaintiff. The sexual battery itself was BULOCHNIKOV committed a sexual battery on Plaintiff. intimidating and threatening. BULOCHNIKOV's intentional, harmful misconduct constituted the constitutional violation, sexual battery, and was itself threatening and intimidating. Rodriguez v. Cnty. of L.A., 96 F. Supp. 3d 990 (C.D. Cal. May 29, 2014).

131. DEFFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50 knew, or should have known, of BULOCHNIKOV's propensity to engage in and his history of engaging in sexual misconduct, and in conscious disregard for the safety of others, including Plaintiff, failed to adequately warn and protect Plaintiff against BULOCHNIKOV.

132. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50 had advance knowledge of BULOCHNIKOV's inappropriate conduct towards others, and yet continued to employ her. DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50, despite their knowledge of BULOCHNIKOV's history of misconduct and propensity to engage in that conduct continued to employ her and/or failed to supervise her. DEFEENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50, despite their knowledge of BULOCHNIKOV's history of misconduct and propensity to continue to engage in that conduct provided BULOCHNIKOV assistance in continuing to perform wrongful acts, including those perpetrated against Plaintiff. DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50, continued to employee BULOCHNIKOV, and failed to supervise her, which constituted ratification and aiding and abetting.

133. By the acts and omissions of DEFENDANTS, Plaintiff has been caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, attorneys' fees, costs of suit and other pecuniary losses not presently ascertained.

134. As a further result of the acts and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. The exact nature and extent of her injuries is presently unknown, and Plaintiff does not know the duration or

permanence of her injuries, but is informed and alleges that some if not all of her injuries are reasonably certain to be permanent in character.

135. Plaintiff is informed and alleges that by engaging in these acts and/or in authorizing and/or ratifying such acts, DEFEENDANTS engaged in willful, malicious, intentional, oppressive and despicable conduct, and acted with willful and conscious disregard of the rights, welfare and safety of Plaintiff.

136. As a result of DEFENDANTS' acts and conduct, Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages for each and every offense and is further entitled to an award of treble damages and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit and exemplary damages as provided in Section 52 of the California Civil Code.

#### TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

# (VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (Cal. Civil Code §51.9)

# (Against All DEFENDANTS and Does 1 through 50, inclusive)

- 137. Plaintiff incorporates all foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint, including the General Allegations, as though fully set forth herein.
- 138. Plaintiff is informed and believes that BULOCHNIKOV intentionally interfered with or attempted to interfere, by threats, intimidation and coercion, with Plaintiff's rights secured by the Constitution as well as the laws of this state, including the right to be free from sexual harassment and assault.
- 139. California Civil Code section 51.9 provides that a defendant is liable for sexual harassment where there is a professional relationship between the Plaintiff and Defendant. As the term "Professional Relationship" is defined by Cal. Civil Code section 51.9(a)(1), Plaintiff was in a professional relationship with DEFENDANTS.
- 140. BULOCHNIKOV engaged in verbal, visual and/or physical conduct of a sexual nature and of a hostile nature based on Plaintiff's gender and national origin. Such sexual conduct was unwelcome, severe and pervasive.

141. At the time of the severe and pervasive sexual conduct against Plaintiff, there was an inability by the Plaintiff to easily terminate the relationship.

142. In addition, DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50, acted with reckless disregard for the rights and safety of Plaintiff and others, and with knowledge of BULOCHNIKOV's propensity and pattern of engaging in inappropriate conduct. DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50 aided, allowed, incited and/or conspired with the denial or attempted denial of Plaintiff's rights as secured by the Constitution and the laws of this state.

143. DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50 knew, or should have known, of BULOCHNIKOV's propensity to engage in and his history of engaging in sexual misconduct, and in conscious disregard for the safety of others, including Plaintiff, failed to adequately warn and protect Plaintiff against BULOCHNIKOV.

144. Upon information and belief, DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50 had advance knowledge of BULOCHNIKOV's inappropriate conduct towards others, and yet continued to employ her. DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50, despite their knowledge of BULOCHNIKOV's history of misconduct and propensity to engage in that conduct continued to employ her and/or failed to supervise her. DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50, despite their knowledge of BULOCHNIKOV's history of misconduct and propensity to continue to engage in that conduct provided BULOCHNIKOV assistance in continuing to perform wrongful acts, including those perpetrated against Plaintiff. DEFENDANTS and/or DOES 1 through 50, continued to employ BULOCHNIKOV, and failed to supervise her, which constituted ratification and aiding and abetting.

145. By the acts and omissions of DEFENDANTS, Plaintiff has been caused to suffer actual damages including, but not limited to, loss of earnings and future earning capacity, attorneys' fees, costs of suit and other pecuniary losses not presently ascertained.

146. As a further result of the acts and conduct of DEFENDANTS, and each of them, Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe emotional and mental distress, anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fright, shock, pain, discomfort and anxiety. The exact nature and extent of her injuries is presently unknown, and Plaintiff does not know the duration or

permanence of her injuries, but is informed and alleges that some if not all of her injuries are reasonably certain to be permanent in character.

147. Plaintiff is informed and alleges that by engaging in these acts and/or in authorizing and/or ratifying such acts, DEFENDANTS engaged in willful, malicious, intentional, oppressive and despicable conduct, and acted with willful and conscious disregard of the rights, welfare and safety of Plaintiff.

148. As a result of DEFENDANTS' acts and conduct, Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages for each and every offense and is further entitled to an award of treble damages and reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit and exemplary damages as provided in Section 52 of the California Civil Code.

### THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

### (INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS)

### (As Against STELLA BULOCHNIKOV And DOES 1 Through 50, Inclusive)

- 149. Plaintiff re-alleges as though fully set forth at length and incorporates herein by reference all of the above allegations, including the General Allegations.
- 150. The intentional actions of BULOCHNIKOV, as set forth in the paragraphs above, and which included, but is not limited to, multiple sexual batteries against Plaintiff, repeated acts of discrimination and verbal and physical abuse and harassment against Plaintiff, and retaliation against Plaintiff for complaining of such improper and illegal conduct, have caused plaintiff severe emotional distress, worry, fear and anxiety.
- 151. The aforesaid conduct of BULOCHNIKOV was outrageous and done intentionally for the purpose of humiliating the plaintiff, and depriving plaintiff of employment and the benefits associated with said employment, and to inflict upon her serious emotional distress.
- 152. As a direct and proximate result of said outrageous conduct of BULOCHNIKOV, plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer severe emotional distress, anxiety, humiliation, and

1	embarrassment, all to plaintiff's damage in an amount within the jurisdiction of this Court, which
2	will be stated according to proof, pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure section 425.10.
3	
4	FOURTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION
5	(BATTERY)
6	(As Against MARIAH CAREY And DOES 1 Through 50, Inclusive)
7	153. Plaintiff re-alleges as though fully set forth at length and incorporates herein by
8	reference all of the above allegations, including the General Allegations.
9	154. Plaintiff, as part of her employment, was required to live at CAREY'S personal
10	residence, and did so from November 2015 through the middle of 2017.
11	155. While living at CAREY'S residence, Plaintiff was subjected to aggressive, abusive
12	and harmful physical conduct by CAREY.
13	156. Defendant's conduct was performed by CAREY with the intent to harm and/or
14	offend Plaintiff.
15	157. Plaintiff did not consent to any of the above conduct by CAREY.
16	158. As a result of the above physically abusive conduct, Plaintiff suffered physical
17	injuries, all of which have caused Plaintiff great pain and will continue to cause Plaintiff great pain
18	in the future, and which will be stated according to proof.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF 1 2 Wherefore Plaintiff LIANNA SHAKHNAZARYAN prays for judgment against 3 Defendants, and each of them, as follows: 1. For a money judgment representing compensatory damages including lost wages, past 4 and future earnings, and all other sums of money, including unpaid overtime and wages and 5 associated penalties, together with interest on these amounts, according to proof; 6 2. For an award of money judgment for physical injury, mental pain and anguish and 7 8 severe emotional distress, according to proof; 9 3. For general damages according to proof; For prejudgment and post-judgment interest; 10 11 For declarative and injunctive relief 5. For Attorney's Fees and Costs of suit; 12 For Recission of Contract; and 13 Punitive damages, according to proof; 14 15 9. For any other relief that is just and proper. 16 DATED: January 16, 2019 GREENE BROILLET & WHEELER, LLP 17 18 19 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Plaintiff LIANNA SHAKHNAZARYAN hereby demands a trial by jury of all causes of action herein.

DATED: January 16, 2019

GREENE BROILLET & WHEELER, LALP

MARK QUIGLEY, ESQ. Attorneys for Plaintiffs